CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

ORDER NO.R5-2006-XXXX

NPDES NO. CA0084891

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE BOEING COMPANY
GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEMS – EX-5 AND GET H-B
INACTIVE RANCHO CORDOVA TEST SITE
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (hereafter Regional Board) finds that:

- 1. The Boeing Company (Boeing or Discharger) submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 24 October 2005, and applied for a modification to its existing authorization to discharge waste under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) from the Interim Groundwater Treatment System for the Inactive Rancho Cordova Test Site (IRCTS). The proposal is a new location for establishment of a second treatment facility and discharge location to that allowed in the existing permit.
- 2. Boeing operated a rocket-testing facility in eastern Sacramento County near Rancho Cordova and Folsom. The facility is on property known as the IRCTS and is currently owned by the Aerojet-General Corporation (Aerojet). Boeing, along with Aerojet, performed practices that have caused the release of pollutants into the vadose zone and groundwater at the IRCTS. The main pollutants of concern at the IRCTS are perchlorate, a component of solid rocket propellant, and volatile organic contaminants (VOCs) such as trichloroethylene (TCE) used in the cleaning of equipment.
- 3. A plume of perchlorate in groundwater has migrated from the IRCTS to the west underneath Mather Field. This plume of perchlorate creates or threatens to create a condition of pollution or nuisance. In response, the Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order No. 97-093 to Boeing and Aerojet requiring the investigation of the extent of perchlorate in groundwater emanating from the IRCTS and the development of an interim remedial measure to contain the perchlorate plume.
- 4. To comply with the Cleanup and Abatement Order, Boeing and Aerojet submitted a plan proposing to extract groundwater from approximately five locations on Mather Field and pipe the water to a central treatment plant for treatment and discharge. Negotiations with Sacramento County, the current leaseholder for Mather Field property where the extraction wells and treatment system are proposed, were protracted. The delay in reaching agreement over a permanent treatment system led to the development of a temporary treatment system using ion exchange to treat water from an extraction well at the head of the perchlorate plume, with discharge of the treated water to an on-site drainage system discharging to Morrison

-2-

Creek. That initial temporary system (EX-5) has been utilized for the past two years and has been in substantial compliance with the NPDES permit. The EX-5 treatment system is shown on Attachment A, a part of this Order.

- 5. The EX-5 system consists of a single extraction well (EX-5) and treatment plant on the west side of Mather Field. The EX-5 treatment plant consists of influent bag filters, an equalization tank and ion exchange vessels for removal of perchlorate. The system is designed to treat an average daily flow of 1000 gallons per minute (gpm) and remove perchlorate to less than 4 micrograms per liter (μg/L).
- 6. The Discharger is proposing a second extraction and treatment system, GET H-B, on Mather Field to eventually provide treatment for all extraction wells associated with the Discharger's cleanup on Mather Field. The GET H-B system is adjacent to Aerojet-General Corporation's GET H-A system, which is designed to treat water from Area 1 of the Western Groundwater Operable Unit and is covered under a separate NPDES permit. Eventually groundwater from extraction well EX-5 will be piped to the GET H-B treatment system and the EX-5 treatment system will be decommissioned. The GET H-B treatment system consists of bag filters, ion exchange for perchlorate removal and granular activated carbon for removal of volatile organics. The system is designed to treat an initial average daily flow of 2000 gpm, with potential expansion to 4000 gpm.
- 7. The EX-5 and GET H-B treatment systems and discharges (Outfall 001 and Outfall 002, respectively) are in Section 24, T8N, R5E, MDB&M. The discharge from the EX-5 system is to a drainage ditch on Mather Field, tributary to Morrison Creek, at Latitude N38° 34′ 7.5″, Longitude W121° 18′ 8.2″ (Outfall 001). The GET H-B discharge is to a drainage ditch adjacent to the GET H-B treatment system at Latitude N38° 38′ 55″, Longitude W121° 14′ 3″ (Outfall 002) and tributary to the drainage ditch receiving the EX-5 discharge, prior to discharge to Morrison Creek. Morrison Creek discharges into Stone Lake over 15 miles downstream from the Mather Field, and eventually to the Sacramento River. See Attachments A and B, parts of this Order.
- 8. The Reports of Waste Discharge for the IRCTS facilities, including data from sampling nearby groundwater wells and the EX-5 system discharge, describes the discharges as follows:

EX-5 Monthly Average Flow:

EX-5 Daily Peak Flow:

EX-5 Design Flow:

GET H-B Monthly Average Flow:

GET H-B Daily Peak Flow:

GET H-B Design Flow:

2.88 mgd

2.88 mgd

2.88 mgd

Ultimate GET H-B Avg. Flow: 5.76 mgd

Ultimate GET H-B Daily Peak Flow: 5.76mgd Ultimate GET H-B Design Flow: 5.76 mgd

Average Temperature: 71°F summer; 67°F winter

pH 7.5-8.5

Constituent	<u>mg/l</u>
COD	<10
Total Suspended Solids	<10
Chlorides	3.0
Sulfate	3.4
Manganese	< 0.02
Aluminum	< 0.050
Zinc	0.011
Arsenic	0.001
Lead	0.003
Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	55
Barium	0.037
Copper	0.006
Chromium	0.010
Nickel	0.015
All Volatile Organic Contaminants	< 0.0005
Perchlorate	< 0.004
Total Dissolved Solids	57

- 9. The ion exchange perchlorate treatment system has been demonstrated to be able to remove perchlorate to below 0.004 mg/l. The effluent limitation is established at 0.004 mg/L to reflect that capability. See also, Finding No. 21, below.
- 10. Granular activated carbon has been demonstrated to effectively remove trichloroethylene and similar volatile organic contaminants to less than 0.5 μg/L and the effluent limitation is established at that concentration. See also, Finding No. 21, below.
- 11. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge.

Basin Plan Findings

12. USEPA adopted the *National Toxics Rule* (NTR) on 5 February 1993 and the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) on 18 May 2000. These Rules contain water quality standards applicable to this discharge. The State Water Resources Control Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California*

-3-

(known as the State Implementation Plan), which contains guidance on implementation of the *National Toxics Rule* and the *California Toxics Rule*.

- 13. The Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition, for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereafter Basin Plan). The Basin Plan designates the beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve water quality objectives for all waters of the Basin. These requirements implement the Basin Plan.
- 14. The permitted discharge to surface water allows some degradation of water quality but is consistent with federal antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 68-16 (Antidegradation Policy) because the permitted discharge is required to result in best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and will maintain the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the state.
- 15. The Basin Plan at page II-2.00 states: "Existing and potential beneficial uses which currently apply to surface waters of the basins are presented in Figure II-1 and Table II-1. The beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams." The Basin Plan does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Morrison Creek, but the Basin Plan does identify present and potential uses for the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta, to which Morrison Creek is tributary. The Basin Plan identifies the following beneficial uses for the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta: municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, agricultural stock watering, industrial process water supply, industrial service supply, body contact water recreation, other non-body contact water recreation, warm freshwater aquatic habitat, cold freshwater aquatic habitat, warm fish migration habitat, cold fish migration habitat, warm spawning habitat, wildlife habitat, and navigation. The Basin Plan states on page II-1.00: "Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning..." and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "... disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses."

Upon review of the flow conditions, habitat values, and beneficial uses of Morrison Creek, and based on hydraulic continuity, aquatic life migration, and existing and potential water rights, the Regional Board finds that the following beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan for the Sacramento - San Joaquin Delta are applicable to Morrison Creek:

a. Domestic Supply and Agricultural Supply

The Regional Board is required to apply the beneficial use of MUN to Morrison Creek based on State Board Resolution 88-63, which was incorporated into the Basin Plan pursuant to Regional Board Resolution 89-056. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has issued water rights to existing water users along Morrison

-4-

-5-

Creek for irrigation and the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta downstream of the discharge for domestic and irrigation uses.

b. Water Contact and Noncontact Recreation and Esthetic Enjoyment

The Regional Board finds that the discharge flows through residential areas, there is ready public access to Morrison Creek, and exclusion of the public is unrealistic. Prior to discharge into the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta, Morrison Creek flows through areas of general public access, residential areas, to the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta. The Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta also offers recreational opportunities.

c. Warm and Cold Freshwater Aquatic Habitat

The California Department of Fish and Game found several warm water species in Morrison Creek. They also reported that a study conducted by the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District found Chinook salmon, a cold water species, in the Bufferlands area, which includes Upper and Lower Beach Lakes. Morrison Creek seasonally flows into the Bufferlands area, which is within the legal boundary of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. CWA Section 101(a) establishes an interim goal of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation uses, i.e., the "fishable/swimmable" goal. The State is required to protect fish and wildlife and recreation uses unless it specifically removes those uses in compliance with the federal regulations at 40 CFR 131.10.

The Regional Board also finds that based on the available information and on the Discharger's application, that Morrison Creek, absent the discharge, is an ephemeral stream. The ephemeral nature of Morrison Creek means that the designated beneficial uses must be protected, but that no credit for receiving water dilution is available. Although the discharge, at times, maintains the aquatic habitat, constituents may not be discharged that may cause harm to aquatic life.

- 16. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Resolution No. 68-16 (hereafter Resolution 68-16 or the "Antidegradation Policy") requires the Board in regulating the discharge of waste to maintain high quality waters of the state (i.e., background water quality) until it is demonstrated that any change in quality will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State, will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses, and will not result in water quality less than that described in the Board's policies (e.g., quality that exceeds water quality objectives).
- 17. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial service supply, and industrial process supply.
- 18. The Basin Plan contains narrative water quality objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity. The toxicity objective requires that groundwater be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in

-6-

humans, plants or animals. The chemical constituent objective requires that groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. The tastes and odors objective requires that groundwater shall not contain tastes or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Reasonable Potential Analysis

- 19. USEPA adopted the *National Toxics Rule* (NTR) on 5 February 1993 and the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) on 18 May 2000. These Rules contain water quality standards applicable to this discharge. The State Water Resources Control Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (known as the State Implementation Plan), which contains guidance on implementation of the *National Toxics Rule* and the *California Toxics Rule*.
- 20. The Basin Plan establishes numerical and narrative water quality objectives for surface and groundwater within the basin, and recognizes that water quality objectives are achieved primarily through the Board's adoption of waste discharge requirements and enforcement orders. Where numerical water quality objectives are listed, these are limits necessary for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of the water. Where compliance with narrative water quality objectives is required, the Board will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders, which will implement the narrative objectives to protect beneficial uses of the waters of the state.
- 21. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an instream excursion above a narrative or numeric water quality standard. Based on information submitted as part of the application and from past monitoring, the Board finds that the proposed discharge has a reasonable potential to exceed standards and objectives for the constituents discussed in the Information Sheet for the following constituents:
 - a. **Trichlorethylene** (TCE). The effluent limitation for TCE is set at 0.0005 mg/L, below the California Public Health Goal and Primary Drinking Water Standard of 0.0008 mg/L and 0.005 mg/L, respectively.
 - b. **Perchlorate** The current Public Health Goal established by OEHHA for perchlorate is 0.006 mg/L. The daily average effluent limitation for perchlorate is established at 0.004 mg/L.
 - c. This Order and the Basin Plan prohibit the discharge of toxic constituents in toxic amounts. Based on information submitted as part of the application and monitoring reports, trichloroethene and perchlorate have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a violation of the Basin Plan narrative prohibition of the discharge of toxic substances

-7-

in toxic concentrations. The Water Quality Standards: Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California; Rule (California Toxics Rule) is promulgated in the Federal Register, 40CFR Part 131, Part III. Effluent limitations for trichloroethene, cis-1,2-DCE and Freon 113 based on the California Toxics Rule and Best Available Technology (as described above), are included in this Order.

22. Section 13241 of the Water Code requires the Regional Board to consider various factors, including economic considerations, when adopting water quality objectives into its Basin Plan. Water Code Section 13263 requires the Regional Board to address the factors in Section 13241 in adopting waste discharge requirements. The State Board, however, has held that a Regional Board need not specifically address the Section 13241 factors when implementing existing water quality objectives in waste discharge requirements because the factors were already considered in adopting water quality objectives. These waste discharge requirements implement adopted water quality objectives. Therefore, no additional analysis of Section 13241 factors is required.

Treated Groundwater Reuse Evaluation

- 23. Under the previous version of this Order, Boeing, in coordination with Board staff, USEPA, California Department of Health Services (DHS), the Sacramento County Water Forum, Aerojet, and selected water purveyors evaluated alternatives of discharge of the treated groundwater other than surface water. In September 2003, Boeing submitted a final version of a report containing this evaluation. That report recommended alternatives for reuse of the groundwater including environmental uses and municipal supply. In August 2003 Boeing and Sacramento County reached an agreement whereby the County has agreed to develop the reuse of the treated groundwater being discharged under this Order. The reuse will include, but be not limited to, the replacement of existing and future lost water supplies and provide supplies for new development in the Rancho Cordova area.
- 24. The Basin Plan adopted by the Board includes a Wastewater Reuse Policy that encourages the reclamation and reuse of wastewater, including treated groundwater resulting from a cleanup action, where practicable. Those reuse options include municipal and industrial supply, crop irrigation, groundwater recharge, and wetland restoration. At this time demonstrated cost-effective options that provide for reuse of the treated groundwater have been identified in Boeing's Reuse Plan, as described in Finding No. 23. The County is currently developing a project for reuse of the treated groundwater that will proceed through the CEQA process. Completion of the County project will likely not occur until Spring 2009.
- 25. The project has a potential effect on the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin from which the IRCTS extraction field takes its water. The Regional Board has addressed this potential effect by evaluating alternatives to allowing the proposed discharge. No feasible alternative to the proposed project exists at this time. Neither reuse nor recharge of the treated groundwater is feasible at this time. Neither direct nor indirect reuse is feasible at this

time and the Regional Board does not have the authority to direct the manner of compliance (e.g., to direct recharge or reuse of the treated groundwater). The alternative of not allowing the proposed discharge to surface waters exists but poses serious environmental consequences because it would impede the cleanup of the groundwater. Pursuant to California Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383, previsions the previous version of this Order required Boeing to submit technical reports evaluating whether there are impacts on the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin caused by the permitted activity and evaluating potential direct and indirect reuse options for the discharged water. On 13 September 2003, Boeing submitted a report that contained the analysis on the affect of the pumping on the aguifer yield. The report stated that there would be an additional drawdown in the eastern part of Sacramento County of up to 30 feet in some locations. Implementation of the reuse alternatives that were identified in the reuse plan described in Finding Nos. 23 and 24, above, will substantially mitigate the impact of the withdrawl of groundwater for remediation purposes. The required evaluations allowed the Board to determine whether there are additional environmental impacts associated with the Dischargers' pumping and the Board will encourage reuse of treated groundwater consistent with the Wastewater Reuse Policy set forth in the Basin Plan.

Other

- 26. Effluent limitations, and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to Sections 301, 302, 304, and 307 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.
- 27. The action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21100, et seq.), requiring preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration, in accordance with Section 13389 of the California Water Code.
- 28. The Department of Toxic Substances Control has certified a final Negative Declaration and Initial Study in accordance with the CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Board has reviewed the Negative Declaration and these waste discharge requirements will mitigate or avoid any significant impacts on water quality.
- 29. The Board has notified the Dischargers and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
- 30. The Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.

31. This Order shall serve as an NPDES permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA, and amendments thereto, and shall take effect upon the date of hearing, provided EPA has no objections.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order No. R5-2005-0017 is rescinded and The Boeing Company, its agents, successors and assigns, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

A. Discharge Prohibitions:

- 1. Discharge of treated wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in Finding No. 7 is prohibited.
- 2. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by the attached Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements A.13.
- 3. The discharge shall not cause the degradation of any water supply.
- 4. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.

B. Effluent Limitations:

1. Effluent from the treatment facility through Outfalls 001 and 002 shall not exceed the following limits:

Constituents	<u>Units</u>	Daily <u>Maximum</u>	Monthly Average
Volatile Organics ^{1,2} Perchlorate	μg/L μg/L	0.5 ¹	4

All volatile organic constituents listed in EPA Methods 8010 and 8020. The concentration of each constituent shall not exceed 0.5 μg/L.

3. The discharge shall not have a pH less than 6.5 nor greater than 8.5.

-9-

For two weeks after placement of new ion exchange resin, the effluent limit for each trihalomethane is 10.0 μg/L.

-10-

- 4. The 30-day average daily discharge flow shall not exceed 2.16 mgd for the EX-5 GET and 2.88 mgd for GET H-B. The GET H-B flow may increase up to 5.76 mgd upon construction of an additional 2.88 mgd of treatment capacity.
- 5. Survival of aquatic organism in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay - - - - - - 70% Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays - - - - 90%

C. Activated Carbon, Resin and Sludge Disposal:

- 1. Collected screenings, sludges, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with *Consolidated Regulations* for *Treatment, Processing or Disposal of Solid Waste*, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Section 20004, et seq.
- 2. Any proposed change in activated carbon, resin or sludge use or disposal practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.
- 3. Transportation and disposal of GAC and resin shall be only by a permitted hauler and disposed at a permitted regeneration/disposal facility.

D. Receiving Water Limitations:

Receiving Water Limitations are site-specific interpretations of water quality objectives from applicable water quality control plans. As such they are a required part of this permit.

The discharge shall not cause the following in the receiving water:

- 1. Concentrations of dissolved oxygen to fall below 7.0 mg/L.
- 2. Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to form a visible film or coating on the water surface or on the stream bottom.
- 3. Oils, greases, waxes, floating material (liquids, solids, foams, and scums) or suspended material to create a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 4. Aesthetically undesirable discoloration.
- 5. Fungi, slimes, or other objectionable growths.
- 6. Turbidity to increase as follows:

- a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
- b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
- c. More than 10 NTUs where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
- d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.
- 6. The normal ambient pH to fall below 6.5, exceed 8.5, or to change by more than 0.5 pH units.
- 7. Deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
- 8. The normal ambient temperature to be increased more than 5°F.
- 9. Taste or odor-producing substances to impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin or to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 10. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that exceed maximum contaminant levels specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22; that harm human, plant, animal or aquatic life; or that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
- 11. Aquatic communities and populations, including vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species, to be degraded.
- 12. Toxic pollutants to be present in the water column, sediments, or biota in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; that produce detrimental response in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life; or that bioaccumulate in aquatic resources at levels which are harmful to human health.
- 13. Violation of any applicable water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Board or the State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to the CWA and regulations adopted thereunder

E. Provisions:

1. The Discharger shall operate the EX-5 treatment facility according to the 1 November 2002 Operation, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan for the Ground Water Extraction and Treatment System, and any approved revisions.

-12-

- 2. The Discharger shall submit a final Operation, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan for the GET H-B Ground Water Extraction and Treatment System for approval within **60-days** following system startup. The Discharger shall operate the treatment systems according to the approved plan, and any approved revisions.
- 3. The Discharger shall conduct the chronic toxicity testing specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. If the testing indicates that the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above the water quality objective for toxicity, the Discharge shall submit a work plan to conduct a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) and upon approval conduct the TRE, and this Order will be reopened and a chronic toxicity limitation included and/or a limitation for the specific toxicant identified in the TRE included. Additionally, if a chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, this Order may be reopened and a limitation based on that objective included.
- 4. The Discharger shall use the best practicable cost-effective control technique currently available to limit mineralization to no more than a reasonable increment.
- 5. The Discharger shall comply with all the items of the "Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements for Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES)", dated February 2004, which are part of this Order. This attachment and its individual paragraphs are referred to as "Standard Provision(s)."
- 6. The Discharger shall comply with the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2006-XXXX, which is part of this Order, and any revisions thereto, as ordered by the Executive Officer.
- 7. Under Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2006-XXXX the Discharger shall report trace concentrations of constituents found during the analysis of samples. Trace values are estimates of concentrations detected between the detection level and the practical quantitation level. Trace values are not always reliable as there is a potential for interferences below the practical quantitation level. As effluent limitations specified in this permit are at or above the practical quantitation level, reporting trace values shall not be a violation of an effluent limitation. Trace values are to be used to help operate the treatment facility and to provide information to minimize violations of effluent limits.
- 8. This Order expires on **1 January 2010** and the Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, CCR, not later than 180 days in advance of such date in application for renewal of waste discharge requirements if it wishes to continue the discharge.
- 9. Prior to making any change in the discharge point, place of use, or purpose of use of the wastewater, the Discharger shall obtain approval of or clearance from the State Water Resources Control Board (Division of Water Rights).

-13-

10. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to this office.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the State of incorporation if a corporation, the name, address, and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Board, and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory paragraph of Standard Provision D.6 and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

I, THOMAS R. PINKOS, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on XX XXXXXXX XXXX.

KENNETH D. LANDAU, Acting Executive Officer

Revised 11/08/05:AMM